

## **AZ Process Standardization Working Group Master Issues List**

Table of Contents

<u>Issue #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1.....	75
2.....	75
3.....	75
4.....	75
7.....	86
8.....	97
9.....	108
10.....	119
11.....	129
12.....	1240
13.....	1240
14.....	1240
15.....	1344
21.....	1344
16.....	1442
43.....	1542
17.....	1543
18.....	1644
19.....	1745
24.....	1846
5.....	1846
20.....	1946
6.....	1947
22.....	1947
23.....	2047
57.....	2048
58.....	2048
59.....	2048
60.....	2148
62.....	2148
63.....	2148
72.....	2148
30.....	2249
31.....	2249

42	2219
49	2320
50	2320
51	2421
75	2421
76	2421
25	2522
33	2623
35	2724
37	2724
39	2825
40	2825
41	2926
45	2926
53	3027
65	3128
66	3128
67	3228
68	3229
64	3330
71	3431
26	3532
27	3633
29	3734
32	3835
44	3936
54	4037
34	4138
52	4138
38	4238
46	4339
47	4440
48	4541
55	4642
56	4743
28	4844
36	4945
61	4945

69	4945
70	4945
73	5046
74	5046
77	5147
78	5147
79	5147
1	5
2	5
3	5
4	5
7	6
8	7
9	78
10	89
11	89
12	910
13	910
14	910
15	1011
21	1011
16	1112
43	1112
17	1213
18	1314
19	1415
24	1516
5	1516
20	1516
6	1617
22	1617
23	1617
57	1717
58	1718
59	1718
60	1718
62	1718
63	1718

72	1718
30	1819
31	1819
42	1819
49	1920
50	1920
51	2021
75	2021
76	2021
25	2122
33	22232322
35	23242422
37	23242423
39	24252523
40	24252524
41	25262624
45	25262624
53	26272725
65	27282825
66	27282826
67	27282826
68	28292926
64	28303026
71	29313127
26	30323228
27	31333329
29	32343430
32	33353531
44	34363531
54	35373632
34	36383733
52	36383733
38	36383733
46	37393834
47	38403935
48	39414036
55	40424137
56	41434238

28	42444339
36	42444339
61	43454339
69	43454440
70	43454440
73	43454440
74	43454440
77	44464440

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
1	Tax Exempt: Does the ESP currently get Tax Exempt status on 810? Is the ESP required to have certificates for existing exempt customers?	Oct 13, 1999	New West Energy		Nov 10, 1999	Resolved. It is the end use customer responsibility to provide tax exemption status to each of their providers.  2/2/2000 Bill Rigsby – ACC will bring the tax statues to the Billing Subcom on 2/9/00 for clarification. This may be included in the recommendation.	E			Resolved. Revisited on 2/2/00 by the Billing Subcom.
2	Credit/Debit Amount by record	Oct 13, 1999	APS		Nov 10, 1999	This will be added to the Implementation Guide as an optional code.  2/2/2000 The above recommendation still applies.	E			Resolved. Revisited on 2/2/00 by the Billing Subcom.
3	Balance (BAL) vs. Total monetary value summary (TDS) for invoice payment. Issue for UDC, they cannot bill past due charges, since they may not be aware of payment amounts and dates.	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	UDC will not send payment information to the ESP since the ESP is covering the customer's receivable to the UDC.  2/2/2000 Resolution still stands. UDC will send current charges only for ESP consolidated billing.  2/8/00 This issue will be looked at when the IG is written	E  3			Pending.  Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
4	Invoice Start & End Date do we need to state on bill?	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Oct 13, 1999	Rule Language R14-2-1617 States that “time period to which the reported information applies  2/2/2000 The proposed rule has changed. It was agreed that both parties shall disclose this information. Reference R14-2-210.	E			Resolved. Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
7	How Rebate/Rebill will be handled?	Oct 26, 1999	APSES/New West Energy			<p>Further discussion needed. We need to confirm this as a business decision. Will this be handled as a cancel/rebill or adjustment line item? Once the discussion is complete – this can be translated to the EDI rule. This issue can be raised in the December 3<sup>rd</sup> Standardization Meeting.</p> <p>UIG – recommends the cancel/rebill scenario.</p> <p>Most UDCs can support the cancel/rebill scenario.</p> <p>The MRSP must post corrected 867s for retrieval by all parties.</p> <p>3 categories of Billing Adjs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Usage Related (dead meter, bad multiplier, etc.) Cancel/rebill</li><li>Rate related (incorrect rate calculation) Cancel/rebill</li><li>Non–usage related (flat rate, tax changes) Misc. Adjustment</li></ol> <p>2/2/2000 This is still an issue. Another issue to consider, what happens if an ESP or UDC discovers a need to backbill and the customer has switched several times since the original billing took place. Reference ACC rules R14-2-210 section E.</p> <p>See Cancel and rebill discussion document.</p> <p>3/8/00</p> <p>Action items: APS will bring a copy of a real 810 showing a cancel rebill and how it is represented in the EDI format. All UDCs need to report on their cancel/rebill thresholds.</p> <p>All participants need to identify some of the business issues in relation to rebate/rebill and misc. adjustments. ESPs will bring real scenarios of their experiences in CA ..</p> <p><u>3/22/00</u></p> <p><u>Discussion took place to have a way of communicating specified rebate/rebill information outside of the 810 for the interim.</u></p> <p><u>Actions: UDC's to discuss the interim proposal and be prepared to discuss outcome</u></p>	E 1			Pending



**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
8	UDC Information - Does the UDC have to pass the contact information address, etc. on each transaction – including the ACC phone number?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>2/2/2000 Stacy reported that she contacted 2 ESPs. Their preference is to have static information such as emergency numbers, etc. not passed each time on the 810 document every time a customer bills.</p> <p>More discussion by market participants is needed.</p> <p>2/8/00 New West – If the UDCs continue to pass static data, they will null it in their system.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> The UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact number and the ACC dispute phone number once. The ESP will provide this information on each bill. The UDC will advise the ESP 30 days written notice in advance of any change to this information.</p> <p><b>As of 2/24//00, the UDCs will make available to the PSWG a consolidated list of UDC Emergency Contact Numbers. It will be the responsibility of the UDCs to communicate to subsequent ESPs , the UDC Contact Number to and ACC dispute number to the ESP at the time of execution of the ESP Service Agreement.</b></p> <p><b>Long-term Solution:</b> The UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact numbers and ACC number to the ESP at the time of certification with the UDC.</p> <p><b>2/24/00 Proposal above was accepted.</b></p>	E  2	X		Resolved

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
9	Are tables graphs applicable this yr/last yr/last month?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>This data will not be passed on the 810 to the ESP for Consolidated Billing.</p> <p>2/2/2000 Resolved pending rule investigation.</p> <p>2/8/00 No requirements found in the Rules. UDC will not pass this information and ESP is not required to print this information on the bill.</p> <p>2/24/00 Issue resolved. The 810 will not have a place to pass last months/last years consumption for the ESP to place in a table.</p>	E  2	X		Resolved

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
10	Business, Regulatory Notices and advertising messages how we would handle? What would be the size (# of lines) and content and placement on the bill? For instance: disconnect notices, Levelized changes, capital credits.  How do we anticipate handling non regulatory messages on the bill	Oct 26, 1999	Group		3/8/00	<p>After further discussion it was decided that we need to offer a bill message field on the guide. This would be to pass Regulatory or Business information. Advertisements would be handled through contractual agreements between ESP and UDC.</p> <p>2/2/2000 Action Item – utilities need to research their company's bill message size, # of characters, # of bill messages used.</p> <p>2/8/00 Action items : UDC will come back with the type of bill messages we intend to send for ESP Consolidated billing. Shirley will bring information from CA, CUBR, UIG.</p> <p>Proposal for broadcast message types: The UDC will post ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory messages on their website in a timely manner and notify the ESP contact of record that there is a new message to be printed on the customer's bill. The ESP will retrieve the new message verbiage from the UDC's website.</p> <p>Proposal for customer specific messages: The UDC will pass the ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory message with the customer's bill data. This will transmit via the normal billing process agreed upon between the UDC and ESP. The ESP is required to print the message on the UDC portion of the consolidated bill.</p> <p>Advertising or business messages will not be passed by the UDC to the ESP for printing on the bill.</p>	E  2	X		Resolved

## **BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
11	Will ESPs want to partake in SurePay? (Debit ESPs Bank Account for monies owed to the UDC)	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	If so, it is a contractual agreement between the ESP and the UDC.  2/2/2000 Resolution Applies	E			Resolved  Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> party Billing (Should UDC continue to offer?)	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	This is an arrangement that will need to be made between the Biller (in this case the ESP) and their customer.  2/2/2000 Resolution applies.	E			Resolved  Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
13	Payment Date appearing on customer's bill.	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	Payment Date, payment amount and payment received date will not be passed to the ESP on the 810 for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill.  2/2/2000 Resolution applies. Since the UDC does not know when or if a payment is actually received from the customer in ESP Consolidate Billing, this information will not be passed.	E			Resolved  Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
14	Transmission Charge should it be displayed on the bill?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	This will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator.  2/2/2000 Any transmission charge identified as an end use customer charge will be included in the UDC portion of the bill. All other charges will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator. Ex: Fixed must run charges are identified as an end use customer bill.	E, U, D			Resolved  Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
15	Does standardization need to allow for Summary Billing - ESP Consolidated Billing?	Nov 10, 1999	Group			<p>Further discussion – UDC would need to pass service periods. Would the UDC un-summarize the customer's bill for ESP Consolidated Billing?</p> <p><b>Opinions:</b> New Energy – The Biller of the end use customer is the entity <u>that</u> should summarize the bill.</p> <p>TEP is not supporting summary billing for Direct Access customers due to cash flow issues. This is suggested in their proposed tariff (Article 24), but they have not been approved.</p> <p>2/2/2000 APSES – The Biller of the end use customer is the entity should summarize the bill.</p> <p>Barry Scott SSVEC -- I think the entity doing the billing should provide the consolidation. I believe the customers will resist having bills coming from all over the place. In some respects, this would be a step back to go from one bill for electrical service to many.</p>	E  3			<u>Pending</u>  <u>Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom-Resolved</u>
21	DA Market Issue – for UDC or Dual billing options, will Summary Billing be available for DA customers?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/2/2000</p> <p>TEP will not offer Summary Billing per pending (Article 24)</p> <p>APS feels it is a billers service. If APS is the biller they will offer these services.</p> <p>SRP will offer these services for Dual or UDC Consolidate Billing.</p>	U, D  3			Pending

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
16	Will ESPs be required to remit charitable contributions? (SHARE/Hero)	Nov 10, 1999	Group		See Issue 43	<p>Further discussion on December 3<sup>rd</sup> Standardization meeting.</p> <p><b>Opinions:</b> New Energy –Does not want to be responsible for tracking and remitting funds back to the UDC for distribution to the charitable organizations.</p> <p>2/2/2000 APSES agrees with New Energy's position. The ESP is liable for the remitting the pledge amounts to the UDC potentially before the customer actually pays the ESP.</p> <p>Barry Scott SSVEC I believe the entity producing the bill should be responsible for collecting the entire payment. They, in turn, should disburse the money accordingly. It will become a quagmire if each competitive entity only feels a responsibility to collect their piece of the pie. (How will we ever handle delinquents and partial payments?) This does not even consider the resentment the customers will feel about having to send checks to all of these diverse places to make sure their electrical bill is paid. I think this reasoning should apply to charitable programs as well, for example "Operation Roundup".</p> <p>2/8/00 Who is responsible for the paper-work if the customer wants to remit charitable contributions</p> <p><u>3/22/00</u> <u>Discussion:</u></p> <p><u>Action: UDC's determine what their position is, why they do the SHARE program, the implications if they don't do it, and a proposal of how to handle this issue.</u></p>	Billing Subcommittee  E  3			Pending

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
43	Is there a regulatory requirement for UDCs to collect and remit charitable contributions to social agencies. Likewise, is there any regulatory requirement for ESP's to participate in collecting or remitting charitable contributions on behalf of an UDC.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee		See Issue 16	2/2/2000 There is potential for state funds to be reduced because there potentially is no requirement to continue these programs.	Billing Subcommittee  E  3			Pending
17	Will the ESPs support levelized UDC billing line items?	Dec 1, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>It could be a hindrance for a customer to go Direct Access (in the case of a large debit balance) the ESPs would not want this large debit balance passed to them for payment.</p> <p>More input from the ESPs and UDCs is needed.</p> <p>2/2/2000 APS is planning to offer this option if they are the Billing entity.</p> <p>TEP is not planning to offer this billing option for DA Customers</p> <p>Barry Scott SSVEC I think any customer desiring to go to competitive access should settle all of their accounts with the UDC first. I believe if we will handle the process as we currently do for a customer going from one UDC to another we will be better off.</p> <p>2/8/00 – SRP will offer Levelized to customers for UDC Consolidated and Dual billing for distribution charges only. APS doesn't offer Levelized for ESP Consolidated. TEP doesn't offer levelized billing for DA customer regardless of the billing option.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> The ESP has the option to offer levelized billing to the end use customer. The UDC will not pass levelized billing line items for ESP Consolidated billing.</p> <p>2/24/00 Above proposal accepted.</p>	E  2	X		Resolved

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
18	For end use customer billing (dual billing situation) the ACC Rules are not specific about the responsibilities of what the utility is obligated to show on their bill and what the ESP is obligated to show on the bill.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/2/2000 In many markets (CA specifically) beginning and ending meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In the Arizona market the utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if the ESPs are required to follow the same rules.</p> <p>This could apply to all revenue cycle services.</p> <p>2/24/00 Bill Rigsby reported on the ACC Rules. Refer to sections in the ACC Rule R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. The verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. Therefore, UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, the ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.</p> <p>Action Items : ESPs and UDCs create a proposal for a short term solution which may require filing for a waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs : Beginning and ending reads must be printed on the bill according to the Rules. Therefore these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>3/8/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p>Action Items: ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their company's position in regards to filing waivers. The group will come up with a proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>3/14/00 It was decided to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, &amp; 56)</p> <p>3/22/00 <u>Proposed Resolution: The bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate the bill</u></p>	E  1			<p>Pending Resolution Pending</p> <p>May require recommended Rule changes for resolution.</p> <p>Will appear on the 3/22/00</p>

1/00 Revision 8  
WG Master Issues List



**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
19	<p>Once the troubleshooting process has taken place, and the UDC is estimatingWhen a UDC estimates a bill (an MRSP did not deliver the data in a timely manner or the read could not be retrieved), should the UDC transmit the estimation reasons for the ESP Consolidated Bill.</p>	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>The group needs to specify under what conditions the UDC could estimate a bill and pass this information to the ESP.</p> <p>2/24/00 Shirley Renfroe reported that the EDI 810 allows for an estimation reason code to be passed to the ESP.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: If the MRSP fails to provide a meter read and the exception processing window has passed, the UDC may estimate and provide an indicator why the bill was estimated. The ESP is required to print this reason on UDC portion of the bill pursuant to Rule 14-2-210-6B.</p> <p>3/8/00 Reason codes need to be developed before this can be resolved.</p>	E  1			Pending Resolution

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
24	When the UDC estimates the bill in ESP Consolidated billing, an agreed upon process and timeframe needs to be set for troubleshooting before the bill is actually sent to the customer.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee – Marilyn Ferrara			<p>2/2/2000 This is a meter reading to data input billing issue. Examples include the CA model – MADEN Meter and Data Exception Notice. Could be impacted by VEE rule differences, etc.</p> <p>2/24/00 Janie Mollon is preparing a suggested model for Arizona to report billing and metering exceptions. Janie will send out proposal and suggestions. Members are to look at and send back comments to Janie. (Recommendation, timeline, with your proposed modification.) Janie will compile for next meeting.</p> <p>3/8/00 The Billing Subcommittee agreed that an exception process such as the MADEN is needed for handling exceptions. The MADEN process will be submitted to the Policy Subcommittee for standardization across all subcommittee exception process. All committee members should review the document in it's entirety and be prepared to discuss implementation issues. Stacy Aguayo will check with CA UDCs to see if more MADEN information is available.</p> <p>Action Item: UDCs need to re-evaluate the time frame of estimation. Is there any flexibility before estimating? What notifications should/are in place for notifying MRSPs of missing data?</p> <p><u>3/22/00</u> <u>take the BEN proposal to our companies and discuss the possibility of implementing this notification process</u></p> <p><u>Be prepared to talk about a possible implementation guidelines</u></p>	E, U and D  1			Pending
5	Reason of Estimate - Do both parties need to give?	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	<p>No. It is the Billers responsibility to print this in the bill using the 867 standard estimation reason codes. See Business Rules.</p> <p>2/2/2000 Resolution stands.</p>	E			Resolved. <u>Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom-</u>

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
20	Can other utility service charges be passed to the ESP for Consolidated Billing (gas, water, sewer, telephone, etc.)	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			2/2/2000 This may not be in the scope of the PSWG charge. We are focusing on the transfer of electric information only. This may need to be addressed at a later date.	E 3			Resolved Pending
6	Should non-utility charges be included on ESP consolidated bills?	Oct 13, 1999	New West Energy		Nov 10, 1999	UDC cannot pass charges for non-utility related charges for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill. Example: home security, Internet services  2/2/2000 Resolution stands.	E			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
22	If a customer has a credit or debit balance on the bill when they switch to DA, is the utility obligated to refund that money?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee		3/8/00	2/8/00 Levelized / Equalizer was briefly discussed regarding the debit or credit balances  2/24/00 In APS territory, they will final out the standard offer account and bill the customer separately if there is a debit. If the customer does not pay and is eligible for disconnect, they notify the ESP. If there is a credit they will refund this to the customer prior to the switch for DA.  Pending Resolution: At the time the customer goes DA and they have a credit balance, with the exception of Capital credits, the UDC will apply it to any outstanding receivable owing. They will then refund the remaining credit directly to the customer in accordance to their applicable Rules and Regulations.  At the time the customer goes DA and the customer has a debit balance, it will be the sole responsibility of the UDC to collect the money from the customer.	E 1			Resolved

## **BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
23	If the utility is holding a deposit for the customer and the customer switches to ESP consolidated billing, is the utility required to refund the entire deposit since the receivable is paid to the UDC by the ESP?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>Stacy went over flow chart for Deposit Process for ESP Consolidated billing and Deposit Process for UDC consolidated billing. (See attachement to Billing minutes for 2/24/00)</p> <p>3/8/00 There is no formal Rule requirement dictating deposit refunds for ESP Consolidated billing customers. The current business processes have been identified (see flow) for TEP, SRP and APS. Other UDCs can submit their deposit business processes to theBilling Subcommittee Chairperson. Deposit requirements are to be determined by the individual companies based on their individual credit policies. No further action needed.</p>				Pending Resolution 3/22/00
57	How will we handle customer bill disputes that are filed with the ACC for ESP Consolidated Billing.	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/8/00 Bill will check at the ACC how often customers file complaints with the ACC for bill disputes. How will UDCs handle the requirement for the ESP to make us whole?</p> <p><u>Action: Bill to check at the ACC for proposed changes</u></p>	Billing Subcommittee E			Pending <u>4/6/00 agenda</u>
58	How will bill inserts be handled for ESP Consolidated billing as it relates to mandated regulatory messages?	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/8/00 ESPs will not print marketing messages on their bill. In CA, UDCs have to submit their inserts to the CPUC for review. If there is marketing language in the inserts, the UDCs have to remove the language. ESPs also have an opportunity to review all messages prior to distribution to the customer</p> <p><u>Action: Be prepared to discuss this issue. UDC's determine procees for removing marketing language from mandatory messages.</u></p>	Billing Subcommittee E Priority # 2			Pending <u>4/6/00 agenda</u>
59	Need clarification on estimating rules specifically section 210-A3-5	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/8/00 Confusion about the load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing?</p>	Billing Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending

**BILLING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
60	According to the rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			2/22/00 According to the rules, there are specifics on how utilities bill a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party but there is no specification for any other market participants. (R14-2-210-E3)	Billing Subcommittee Priority #2			Pending
62	If back billing is required for period where the customer is both Standard Offer and DA, for ESP Consolidated Billing, the ESPs will want to bill/pay only the DA period	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee		Refer issue #7	<a href="#">3/22/00</a> <a href="#">Janie to bring California options to next meeting.</a>  <a href="#">Action: UDC's to see how can supply intermittent data.</a>	Billing Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending <a href="#">4/6/00 agenda</a>
63	If UDC or ESP charges are not transmitted by the drop dead date/time, what is the responsibility of the biller to include language on the bill advising the customer of missing charges.	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee				Billing Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending 3/8/00 agenda
72	How are adjustments going to be handled in the 810.	2/24/00	Billing Subcommittee		Refer to issue #7	How will we communicate reason for Misc. adjustments.	Billing Group Priority #1			Pending <a href="#">4/6/00 agenda</a>

**REMITTANCE & TRANSACTION ERROR ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considerations and customer service (for problem resolution and cycle time of EDI 824)?	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00	Resolution Pending 2/8/00	1/27/00 For example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours.  All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.	Remittance and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Resolution Pending 2/8/00
31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to the ESP and payment directly to the bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to the bank? (single path)	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00		Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to the sending parties.	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Pending
42	Will we require an 824 on all transaction (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data?	2/1/2000	Policy Subcommittee				Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
49	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to bundled service.	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending
50	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bundled service.	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending

**DASR/ENROLLMENT ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
51	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. . "Account Update" - Notification of changed account information. [The UC and PD DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DASR Handbook	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending
75	On the incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. The state DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations.		Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee				DASR Subcommittee			Pending
76	On the DASR – the forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR?		Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			In step 3 of the Metering Business processes, the pending meter owner is also required. The meter owner may change from the time the DASR is set to the time the meter is exchanged.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending



**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads.	1/26/00	Billing Subcommittee			1/26/00 - Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If the utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.  2/1/00 – What is the utilities responsibility to audit the MRSPs? The rules state this certification must take place yearly.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
33	For access to a meter, some UDCs require the ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from the customer. In many cases, the customer does not have the key.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 APS is not going to provide keys to the MSP. They would like the MSP to get the key from the customer.</p> <p>Issues: Customers may not have keys. Utility keys may not be able to be duplicated. Or utilities may want to offer a dual locking device on a contractual basis with utilities and MSPs.</p> <p>New West Energy – This is a barrier to getting access to change meters for customers to go DA.</p> <p>Suggestion - If the customer is releasing their customer data (historical) anyhow, could the key process be incorporated in the release?</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> All Utilities need to research what their key policy is and report to subcommittee by 2/16/00.</p> <p>Janie Mollon will bring CA access process.</p> <p>Per Jamie – Schlumberger – In the case of customer's lock, they are just cutting the lock and then supplying a new lock to the customer. The customer is then responsible for getting a key to the UDC fof access to the site.</p> <p>Per Marv Buck – CUBR is suggesting that the UDCs change customer supplied locks with UDC supplied locks. Then the UDC retains possesion of the master key and they can supply the customer with slave keys for them to get to the MSP and ESP.</p> <p>Pending Resolution: For customer supplied locks, the MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply the customer with a new lock and keys. It is the customer's responsibility to ge t the new key to the UDC. The MSP will communicate access changes back to the UDC on the MIRN form in the remarks section .</p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Pending Resolution on 3/30/00

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
35	At what point does an ESP take responsibility on a meter exchange? And who is responsible for energy consumption during the exchange?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 <b>Action Items:</b> Utilities need to report on their processes on 2/16/00.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending
37	Load research meters- Are the UDCs intending have a dual meter installed or are they going to pick another sample customer when the customer goes DA? Also, will the UDCs allow the ESPs to use existing phone line for to read the meter for DA purposes? Or vice versa.....can the UDC use ESP phone lines?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 <b>Action Items:</b> Utilities to document and report what the process will be for handling Load Research meter by 2/16/00.  2/16/00 SRP will choose new sample. In most cases phone line is owned by the customer  APS will choose new sample. In a few cases they will remove their existing phone line.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
39	Do the DA meters installed have to have a visual display? Why? This limits the equipment types that can be installed?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 The TR Recorder does not have a display. The requirement came from a EUSERC.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> Utilities need to report on their needs for the display by 2/16/00. Jeanine/APS will check with the EUSERC requirements. ESPs will report on what impacts this requirement could have in their orgs.</p> <p>According to ANSI a displayed is not 'required'. Further discussion is needed. Metering boxes are the way the technology is moving....therefore no display. This may be a customer issue.</p> <p>Utilities to report on why a display is needed.</p> <p>Darrel Pichoff to check with RUCO to see if there's a requirement.</p> <p>3/2/00 Per Prem Bahl of RUCO: RUCO's position is: there must be a visual display on all electric meters for residential consumers. The consumer must be able to read the kWh and kW readings. RUCO will insist on this.</p> <p>K.R. Saline represents 24 Irrigation Districts, Electrical Districts, and Municipalities. KRS will insist on visual displays on electric meters for both residential and commercial customers.</p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending
40	What are the UDCs processes for scheduling MSP work? What if an MSP picks a date to remove and install a meter and the schedule must be changed? How are these exceptions handled?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 This issue may be addressed when we start to review the data elements. The utilities must be able to speak to the schedules on metering.</p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			1/27/00 In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring that the newly installed meter can be read prior to 1 <sup>st</sup> billing by the MRSP or face penalties.  2/3/00 Per 1 <sup>st</sup> Point – This is usually done at the meter install time.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending
45	Standardization data content, data format and data transmission is needed for Metering Data.	2/3/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 Fax and email are not acceptable forms of data transmission. TPs are not able to populate the databases.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
53	ISSUE: Blackout period for Direct Access meter exchanges is too long and is not consistent between UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>Currently, the 3 largest UDCs require that meters that need to be exchanged for Direct Access service cannot be exchanged for a period of time around the current meter's read date. The length of time varies by UDC, but extends up to approximately 9 working days for one UDC. This requirement is problematic for ESPs and MSPs because it effectively allows meters to be exchanged during only half of the month for each account (9 working days equates to approximately half of a calendar month). When a customer has multiple accounts on multiple read cycles that all require meter exchanges, the MSP must plan their installation schedule around the UDC blackout period. This makes it virtually impossible to exchange multiple meters on consecutive days during the month. Since most certified MSPs are installing meters with out-of-state personnel, this requirement adds to the cost of meter exchanges for MSPs and ultimately for ESPs and customers. RECOMMENDATION: The Metering Working Group should examine the process for meter exchanges and shorten or eliminate the blackout period requirement. The group should look at best practices in other states where blackout periods have been eliminated or greatly reduced to foster a more efficient competitive market. Where possible, the blackout periods should be consistent across the UDCs in the state.</p> <p>Suggestion from Janie Mollon – NWE: To switch a customer MSP could not install a meter 5 workdays before a read date or 2 workdays after a read date. The actual switch happens on the read date.</p> <p>3/16/00 Jim Wontor APSSES brought another proposal. Eliminate blackout periods and allow customer's to switch on exchange date.</p> <p>Action Item: The ESPs will consolidate their proposals for a best practice suggestion on 3/30/00.</p>	Metering Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
65	The Arizona 867requires the MRSPs or UDCs to pass billing reads. Is this necessary? Could the Interval data only be passed? Then the UDC/ESP would be responsible for creating the billing reads. Determine if the read will be encoded or calculated.	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Action: Confirm that it is a requirement to have both beginning and ending reads. Yes this is a requirement. 3/16/00 Per APS – Joe Webster, They need both the interval and billing reads. This is used for the VEE process. They would need reads off of the register (encoded), not calculated reads.  Per SRP – Greg Carrel – on interval data accounts, they bill off of the interval data only. The interval data is VEEed on the interval data.  Per Navapache – Dennis Hughes – They have approx 7,000 interval data accounts. However, they bill off of the billing reads.  Per TEP – On very select occasions, they will bill off of IDR data. However, they will validate on the billing reads.  Action Item: A small subcommittee will review possible solutions to this issue: Marv Buck, Janie Mollon, Tim Jones, Kimane Aycock, Joe Webster, Darrell Shear, Greg Carrel, and reps from TEP. They will report back to Metering Subcommittee on 4/13/00.	Metering Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending
66	How are the UDCs identifying the master meter and then showing subsequent sub-meters?  Is there a common way to identify the meters with the same address with multiple meters? Currently the UDC issues one MI form per meter.	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Action: Identify how the UDCs are handing totalized metering and sites with multiple meters.	Metering Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
67	If a master metered account goes DA, does the ESP lose grandfathered agreements to continue with the master metering?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			This is an action item for the UDCs.  Dave Rumolo will research FERC requirements.	Metering Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending
68	Site Meets – What are the UDCs policies?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			This will be added to the Business Rule Document.	Metering Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending Resolution



**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
64	<p>How many decimal places should be required before applying the multiplier to a demand read?</p> <p>How many decimal places should be required for billing demand?</p> <p>Issue: In the 867, when we convert the kW back to a read how many decimals places need to be accommodated?</p> <p><b>Issue: Do we want the MRSP to give us usage/multiplier or give us the actual read (w/ two decimal places)?</b></p>	2/16/00	Policy Group			<p><b>Action:</b> Can CIS multipliers be changed to “one” since the MRSP is adding in the multiplier to the demand provided in the 867.</p> <p>Review the 867 guideline to determine if the billing demand posted should have the multiplier applied to it. – The MSP is required to apply the multiplier to the demand.</p> <p>Action Item: Utilities need to research when a demand figure is received from an MRSP, what is their process for backing out the multiplier and extracting the read.</p> <p>Considerations: Decimal points accommodated and having different multipliers for demand meters in the CIS systems.</p> <p>Action: Check 867 requirements to ensure we are all on the same page. Check for all issues pertaining to the 867 (issue #64, #46, &amp; #65)</p> <p>3/16/00 What is happening on the MRSP reads, the reads are coming with inconsistent . Some are coming with 1 decimal place, while others are being shown with up to 4 decimal places. The problem is that the UDCs take demand reads up to 2 decimal places. Any more than 2 decimal places are either truncated or rounded by the UDCs in order to bill. This could cause the demand calculation to be off from what the other party would be billing.</p> <p>Possible Solution: The MRSP can deliver the read rounding to 2 decimal places. Or the demand be figured on the interval data only.</p> <p>Both the ESP and the UDC would have to bill off of the same value (kW figured on read or interval data) to ensure the same billing kW figure.</p> <p>Currently the ESPs are not billing on demand. This will be come a when they decide to start billing the demand. If they were to bill off of the demand, they would extract it from the interval data. Although the read would still need to be supplied for VEE.</p> <p>Action Item: The participants need to go back to their companies to see if they can handle kW reads to 2 decimal places. Are the parties willing to say that this would be the standard.</p> <p><u>Per feedback from MRSPs, can accommodate 2 decimal places on the kW read.</u></p> <p><u>Pending Resolution: On April 17, all participants will report 2 decimal places on the kW read. The utilities will communicate to the market participants the change to the Arizona 867. The UDCs must make the appropriate changes to the implementation guides.</u></p>	Metering Group			Pending <a href="#">Resolution</a>

**METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and the UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or I turn off a customer prior to the switch, what is the process to notify the ESP that the customer will be disconnected.	2/24/00	Billing Subcommittee			Defining Issue: This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process.	Metering Group Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
26	XML versus EDI  What is XML? Should this be considered for a best practice for the Arizona's model?	1/25/00	ACC Staff – Deb Scott and Jerry Smith			1/25/00 – This is an issue for the policy group to investigate. This is not a transport mechanism, it is defined as a data structure.  2/1/00 – Ray Wensel, Excelergy, offered to coordinate a presentation to the PSWG on XML. Evelyn Dryer will address with ACC and possibly get this on a large group agenda.	Policy Group  Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
27	<p>Companies are defining 'workdays' for time frames for work to be completed. The problem is that some companies are including holidays that are not recognized by others. Need to define 'standardized workday'.</p> <p>Suggested Resolution: NERC holidays recognized but modified. If a NERC holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday and if the holiday falls on a Sunday it is recognized on a Monday.</p> <p>Standardized Work Days: Any day except Saturday/Sunday or NERC holiday. If holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday. If the holiday falls on a Sunday, it is recognized on a Monday.</p>	1/26/00	Billing Subcommittee		2/29/00	<p>1/26/00 For example: In some territories Columbus Day, MLK Day are recognized as holidays and are excluded from a workday calculation. This could effect time periods defined for metering, meter reading, Consolidated billing and enrollment.</p> <p>2/1/00 – Standardization of holidays may not be possible.</p> <p>Suggestion 1: If a Federal or State Holidays are defined, these could be used as an exception to workdays for ALL participants.</p> <p><b>Suggestion 2: Use NERC definition of holiday. Evelyn Dryer to provide to the Policy Group.</b></p> <p><b>Action Item for Policy Group: All participants need to take these suggestions to their organizations to see what will work. Items to consider: Cash flow, bill cycles, read cycles, settlement etc. Also, Please bring a list of your organizations recognized holidays. Be prepared to discuss impact to company's if we recommend NERC holidays only, OR if we were to recognize all State and Federal Holidays. Due by 2/15/00</b></p> <p><b>Darrell Pichoff to bring list of Postal/Federal Holidays.</b></p> <p><b>Steve Olea to bring list of State Holidays.</b></p> <p><b>2/16/00 – Pending Resolution (see UDC holiday matrix – enclose with minutes).</b></p>	Policy Group  Priority #1	x		Resolved

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
29	Are 997s required for all transactions? Is that going to be our recommendation for the Arizona standards?	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00		1/27/00 997s are an industry standard transaction (EDI syntax validation)  2/1/2000 – Yes a 997 acknowledgement is required on all standardized EDI transaction sets. Policy group will recommend that the level of acknowledgement should be determined by the individual trading partners.  2/8/00 – Is a 997 required for meter data that is extracted from a MRSP web site?	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
32	What is the true costs of CT/VT (PT) if an ESP wants to buy the equipment? Cost to replace equipment at today's market price OR cost to UDC and depreciated by years since installation.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue 44 &54	#23,44, & 54: Renee will have more information regarding these items for the 3/8/00 meeting.  3/7/00 (ref: 32,44,&54) Suggestions: lease CT/PT/VT's or have a long- term purchase plan.  APSES/Jim W: will contact California to see how they handle CT PT ownership issues.  Action: UDC's discuss w/ companies lease agreements, long term pymt plans and their defense on why want to own them.  Action: Clarify rule 14-2-1612-K10.  Action: All market participants review rule 14-2-1612-K10. Determine if want to interpret/re-word using UDC shall own, UDC shall not own, may own or may own at the discretion of the customer. Be prepared to defend/come to a consensus.  3/14/00  Costs range from roughly \$230-\$3500  Action: ESP's to provide more detail regarding the long-term payment plan (how much/how long).  APS/TEP will not support a leasing option  APS will support the payment plan option only if for the life of the contract between the ESP & customer.  <u>3/22/00</u> <u>Discussion:</u> <u>ESP's don't want to resort to a lease/pymt plan option until the issue of the UDC's maintaining ownership of the CT/PT's has been resolved.</u>	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1		Pending agenda item for <u>3/2227/00</u>	

1/00 Revision 8  
WG Master Issues List

38

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
44	Clarify ownership of CT and VTs (PT) based on voltage level.	2/3/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue 32 & 54	2/3/00 Group will refer to ACC Rules.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending Agenda Item for 3/14/00

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
54	Ownership of Current Transformers (CTs) and Voltage Transformers (VTs formerly known as PTs) is not consistent across UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES		See issue 32 & 44	: The ACC rules for Direct Access and the Electric Competition Act provide for a UDC to own and maintain both CTs and VTs. However, the interpretation of these rules differs by UDC. One UDC mandates that CT/VTs be purchased by the Customer or the ESP/MSP if they are below a certain voltage size. Another UDC maintains ownership and maintenance responsibilities of CT/VTs for all Customers, and the third major UDC maintains ownership of the CT/VTs, but requires the ESP/MSP to maintain them. This inconsistency creates difficulty for an ESP, especially when dealing with Customers with facilities in more than one service territory. Requiring the ESP/MSP or Customer to purchase the equipment also adds a potentially significant cost and may be a barrier for many Customers who otherwise might seek alternative suppliers. In California, CT/VTs are treated as part of the UDC distribution system and ownership and maintenance responsibilities are retained by the UDC.  RECOMMENDATION: The Metering Working Group should look at the intent of the language in the competition rules regarding equipment ownership and make a determination on CT/VT ownership that all UDCs can implement on a consistent basis.  3/14/00 Action: APS/TEP will investigate whether they can agree to own CT/VT's above the secondary voltage level (600 volts or less). (This will not require a rule change...it will require a tariff change).  Action: APS will determine amount of primary customer accounts.  Issue: Can the customer own their own CT/PT's? Need clarification of the rules.	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1		Pending Agenda Item for 3/24/00/28/00	

1/00 Revision 8  
WG Master Issues List



Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
34	There is no formalized process to report meter exceptions between UDCs and ESPs. (Examples: agreement metering programming, if MI/MAC forms are not completely filled out, etc. See MADEN for details on exception reasons.)	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See Issue 52	<a href="#">Janie will provide information regarding this.</a>  <a href="#">Proposed Resolutions: It has been agreed that a formal communication method (similar to MADEN) will be utilized. The details of what data elements/guidelines will be discussed in both the metering &amp; billing subcommittees.</a>	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending <a href="#">Resolution</a>
52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and the UDCs	1/25/00	APSES		See Issue 34	This process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve the problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root cause analysis is complete. The a standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible. An example of the California "MADEN" process is attached to the original change control document. This process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs .	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending <a href="#">3/28/00 Agenda</a>

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
38	Will the UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Janie will clarify at the 3/13/00 meeting.  Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes  Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. The ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide the information of all sites (even those not going DA) to the customer. If there is no IDR meter at the site, the customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from the UDC and pay the associated costs.	Policy Issue  Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
46	All Arizona EDI (DASRs, 867, 810, 650) should utilize GMT for the business transactions and local time for the enveloping. To avoid problems and unnecessary costs to conform to national standardization in the future, standard time references should be implemented immediately by each UDC, and EDI mapping can be phased in.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>This change would help market participants, particularly MDMAs/MRSPs, to save costs by not having to adapt their systems to Arizona's unique requirements.</p> <p><b>Action Item: All participants need to see what the use of GMT will do to their systems.</b></p> <p><b>2/16/00</b> <b>Proposal:</b> All participants will use GMT format for all transactions that require a time stamp.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> find out how long the conversion to the GMT format will take.</p> <p>The group came to consensus</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> All Arizona EDI transaction set data content will utilize GMT time and GMT time code. The enveloping of the EDI transactions will utilize the sender's local time.</p> <p>Implementation Issue: This recommendation refers to the ACC rule that states data transmission will be sent in Arizona time.</p> <p>The Policy Group will recommend a change to the ACC Rules.</p> <p><u>3/28/00</u> <u>Determined this is not a rule change it is actually noted in the CC&amp;N's.</u></p> <p><u>Action: Paul will talk with the ACC to determine what needs to take place to get the issue resolved. Can staff just send a notice to the existing certified entities advising them of the change to GMT?</u></p>	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1	X	Resolved	

1/00 Revision 8  
WG Master Issues List

43

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures.	1/25/00	APSES			A working group of market participants should study the intent of the Commission Rules and make a determination that applies to all UDCs. The Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #2			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
48	<p>For all Billing and Metering data, UDCs should employ the same rule and/or formula for rounding up data and rounding in calculations. The business process should be implemented immediately by each UDC.</p> <p>Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures.</p> <p>Resolution: No standardization needed.</p>	1/25/00	APSES		2/29/00	<p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by differences in data and billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion will be reduced.</p> <p><b>Action Items: All participants need to investigate what their rounding processes are on meter reading and billing. They also need to investigate how their CIS/MDMA systems handle rounding.</b></p> <p>2/16/00 Jim will provide more examples to help define the issue.</p> <p>2/22/00 Jim brought examples of rounding issues. Jim found that these issues were not widespread and the magnitude is fairly small. These issues will be discussed with the individual UDCs. Pending resolution at the 2/29/00 meeting</p>	<p>Policy Subcommittee</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	X		Resolved

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>DISCUSSION: The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as for meter information, for submitting Direct Access Service Requests, for meter installations or removals, for meter reading services, for consolidated and/or dual billing, and for settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by the other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for the same service, the fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All of the additional fees provide an additional barrier to the development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: In order for a viable market to develop in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to be recovered by the UDCs.</p>	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #2			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
56	Non-availability of local alternatives for providing competitively priced metering services.	1/25/00	APSES		See Issue 28 & 36	Currently, there are very few Meter Service Providers (MSPs) or Meter Reading Service Providers (MRSPs) that have facilities and personnel in Arizona. Most of the certificated providers are based out-of-state and cannot, by ACC rules, subcontract with non-certificated personnel in the state. This potentially drives up the cost of some services that require personnel to travel to Arizona. Additionally, since the UDCs cannot provide competitive metering services beyond the year 2000, most have chosen not to provide a full menu of services during the year 2000. Both of these factors produce situations where the cost of providing competitive metering services are higher than they would be if they were provided by personnel already located in the state. The Policy Working Group should recommend that, to stimulate the market and the cost effective provision of competitive services, the following changes should be made: 1. UDCs should be allowed to provide competitive metering services at a competitive market price, and 2. MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.  3/14/00 Barb Klemstine will change the wording on the MSP qualifications/requirements that is attached to the CC&N in regards to item 3. She will include wording so that the MSP & their agents will be held to the same rules.	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #2		Pending agenda item for 3/21/00	

1/00 Revision 8  
WG Master Issues List

47

White Paper Results:  
1. TEP & APS agree – waiver will be needed  
2. TEP & APS don't agree due to procurement & labor issues

White Paper Results:

- TEP & APS agree – waiver will be needed
- TEP & APS don't agree due to procurement & labor issues

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
28	Clarification on when an UDC can be an MSP. Both sets of Direct Access rules have different definitions. (ACC Rules and HB 2663)	1/26/00	DASR Subcommittee		See Issue 56 & 36	<p>1/26/00 For example, in APS territory they cannot be an MSP for any customer except under 20 kW and residential customer.</p> <p>Additionally, when are meter exchanges required within the service territories.</p> <p>2/1/2000 – In service territory’s governed by the ACC Competition Rules: See section R14-2-1615-B. On January 1, 2001 no affected utility can offer competitive services.</p> <p><b>Issue still remaining: What if there are no service providers offering these services at a competitive rate after 1/1/01 that make it cost effective for customers to switch? This is a Commission and Legislative issue.</b></p> <p>Barbara Klemstine: Will provide a proposal to the group next week showing why the UDC can be an MSP.</p> <p>Action: take Barbara’s “white pages” to our companies to see if any problems/issues with the document. Be prepared to discuss next week. May need to create a waiver for this.</p> <p><u>Action: APS to determine implementation issues regarding issues #28, #36, &amp; #56</u></p> <p><u>Barry Scott does not want a rule written that the choice of the MSP has to be chosen by the ESP. It should be the customer's choice.</u></p>	Policy Subcommittee	Priority #1	Pending	
										There is still the issue remaining which will be included on the ACC report.
										Agenda Item for 3/21/00



**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
36	ACC Rules Question: Can the UDC provide metering and installation services for DA customer? Short term and after January 1, 2001?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue # 56 & 28	<b>Action Item:</b> Participants need to read the ACC and HB2663 and be prepared to discuss issue.	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending  <b>Will appear on the 3/21/00 Agenda</b>
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's? What is the process for communicating this information?	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee				Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending
69	What is the enforceability of the recommended processes or rules of non-ACC jurisdictional entities?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Where does an ESP file noncompliance complaints for those entities that are not governed by the ACC rulings?	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending
70	A utility can back-bill a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party (if the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party is at fault) up to 12 months (R14-212-e3). This is only specific to the utility. Should the rule be applicable to other participants other than just the utility?	2/22/00	Policy Group			Should this Rule be modified to allow all parties providing meter data to be back-billed by the recipients of the incorrect data?	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #3			Pending

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
73	Is NERC using Standard Central Time in Non-EDI transactions?  <u>Why is NERC using Standard Central Time and should we be using it?</u>	2/29/00	Policy Subcommittee			3/7/00 Address once NERC has made their decision on which standard time to use.  <u>Suggestions:</u> Send a letter to NERC recommending GMT.  <u>Action:</u> talk w/ your companies to see if support the GMT format (issue #46) as a standard so can file for a joint waiver. E-mail to Evelyn by 3/13/00. Evelyn will write the waiver to present to the ACC.  <u>Yes, NERC is using Central Standard Time</u>  <u>3/28/00</u>  <u>Action: Shirley &amp; Jim will flow out process' for converting data to Standard Time Zones.</u>	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1			Pending  On 3/13/00 agenda
74	Navapahce will be submitting a report to the PSWG regarding what their business processes will be for DA.	3/2/00	Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			How should this report be represented in the 6/15/00 ACC report? This opportunity may need to be offered to all cooperatives.	Policy Subcommittee  Priority #1 (once the report is presented)			Pending

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
<a href="#">77</a> <a href="#">NEW</a>	The UMI was presumed to be the national standard for identifying a single meter. However, it's not being used by any other state in the dereg market. Furthermore most of the EDI documents are not implementing a UMI number.	3/16/00	Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		<a href="#">3/28/00</a>	<p>Representatives from New West Energy, APSES, 1<sup>st</sup> Point and Schlumberger are not using this number.</p> <p>It was suggested that this number no be implemented as an Arizona standard.</p> <p><a href="#">3/28/00</a> <a href="#">APSES does not need the UMI</a></p> <p>- <a href="#">Jim W advised that the UMI is not being used by MSPs (First Point &amp; Schlumberger) in CA.</a></p> <p>- <a href="#">This is not an industry standard that we thought it would be.</a></p> <p>- <a href="#">No compelling reason for market participants to use the UMI standard.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Proposition: Request that the Utilities Director remove the requirement of using the UMI standard from the 5/1/99 report.</a></p>	<a href="#">Policy Subcommittee</a>  <a href="#">Priority #1</a>			Pending <a href="#">Resolution</a>
<a href="#">78</a> <a href="#">New</a>	<a href="#">There is no language in the rules keeping the MSP from contracting directly with the customers, how should this issue be addressed?</a>	<a href="#">3/28/00</a>	<a href="#">Policy Group</a>			<a href="#">System implications – Will the MSP have to submit DASR's?</a>				Pending
<a href="#">79</a> <a href="#">New</a>	<a href="#">What happens when the designated providers - MSP specifically - change before the switch has taken place?</a>	<a href="#">3/30/00</a>	<a href="#">Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee</a>			<a href="#">On the DASR the MSP is indicated, however the ESP may decide to use another certified MSP before the meter is actually switched (this may be for operational reasons, possibly one MSP can exchange the meter sooner than the one designated on the DASR). Currently, an update DASR needs to be sent to update this relationship – Is there a more efficient way to communicate this information?</a>				Pending

**POLICY ISSUES**

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	